UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/840,108	05/05/2004	Martin Weel	1116-064	9463
	7590 08/31/201 TERRANOVA CT	EXAMINER		
	Y FOREST DRIVE , SU	DAFTUAR, SAKET K		
CARY, NC 27518			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2451	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/31/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/840,108	WEEL, MARTIN	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	OF ITELL TO DETAIL	2401
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 August 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converge NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		Const. Clad announders of a second constant
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 11-18,31,32,34-44 and 50-56. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		i be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
 12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>08/12/20</u>	<u>010</u>
/S. K. D./	/KAMAL B DIVECHA/	
Examiner, Art Unit 2451	Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2451

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant assigned representative mostly concerns are related to the entry of proposed amendment where applicant has changed "local realm" to "realm" only by deleting the term "local". Based on examiner interpretation, the proposed amendment will be entered.

a). Applicant arguments that neither Johnson nor Pierre teaches or suggests identification by a device of a local realm, user selection of the local realm, transmission of a password associated with the local realm; or a list of device identifiers that is provided after transmission of the password.

In response to applicant's arguments a), examiner respectfully reminds applicant that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "a list of device identifiers that is provided after transmission of the password.", i.e, providing a list of device identifier after transmission of password is not recited in the claims) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As such examiner considers the following combination of Johnson and Pieere where Johnson is directed to a transmission of situation location information from a server data processing to a receiving data processing whereas the delivery event associated with a current positional attribute of the receiving data processing system. See below:

"Provided is transmission of situational location dependent information from a server data processing system to a receiving data processing system. The server data processing system communicates with the receiving data processing system in a manner by pushing content when appropriate. A candidate delivery event associated with a current positional attribute of the receiving data processing system is recognized and a situational location of the remote data processing system is determined. The candidate delivery event may be a location and/or direction change, device state change, or movement exceeding a movement tolerance. The situational location of the remote data processing system may be its location, direction, location and direction, proximity to a location, state change, or location and/or direction relative to a previous location and/or direction, or combinations thereof. A set of delivery content from a delivery content database is transmitted from the server data processing system to the receiving data processing system according to the situational location of the receiving data processing system, and according to delivery constraints. The delivery content is configurable by authorized administrators on an instant activation basis for proactive delivery." (Abstract)

In another word, Johnson teaches network communication, one must identify location of the communicating device from plurality of devices from network or networks or plurality of computer networks. In network communication, the person skilled in the art would clearly recognize such device identification when communication is established. see figure 1 and 6 for more detail where Johnson has disclosed locating physically connected device, whether or not such device is part of the network and determining their network address based on their current location (see column 12, line 49 - column 13, line 15) and briefly discloses identifying a device that is member of the realm in response to transmitting the password. In other word, identifying a device after being authenticated or authorized, not transmitting a list of device identifier.

Examiner considers that, as per claim 11, Johnson discloses broadcasting a signal [see figure 5A-5B, see column 12, lines 12-41] from the first device [controller, server, administrator, communicating with wireless devices via the base stations, see column 8, lines 6-65] operative to be received by one or more second devices, (see figures 14, column 21, line 17 - column 23, line 39, deliverable content list based on id, see administrator selected to list his deliverable content database record, then the deliverable content database is searched using the administrator's authorization id against the authorization id field, see column 6, line 55 - column 7, line 41, see figures 1-6) from the one or more second devices; receiving, at the first device, at least the identifier from the one or more second devices in response to the request (see column 6, line 55 - column 7, line 41, see figures 1-6); receiving, at the first device, at least one desired location identifier from the at least one location identifier received from the one or more second devices in response to the signal (see figure 5A-5B, see column 12, lines 12-41, the cell controllers selects the strongest signal and extract unique identifier from the return signal); transmitting from the first device a password [administrator's authorization ID, whereas authorization ID for example could be a password for user identifier (see column 14, line 18-32), searched in deliverable content database records against the authorization ID field discloses that each content is transmitted to database with administrator or controller authorization ID] associated with one desired location identifier (see figure 14, column 22, line 30 – column 23, line 17) in response to the user input; and in response to transmitting the password associated with the at least one desired location identifier (see figure 14, column 22, line 30 – column 23, line 17).

However, Johnson is silent about identifying a local realm of which the receiving or transmitting device is a member.

Pierre teaches identifying a local realm or realm [local area network, local realm, examiner considers Pierre disclosure of "multiple network attached devices being identified by the remote control device. After Identification of the network attached device, the remote control device dynamically learns the codes of the identified network attached device through a sequence of protocol defined request and response

message."] of which the receiving or transmitting device is a member (see column 4, line 25 – column 5, line 32, column 8, line 55 -column 10, line 50).

Pierre on the other hand is directed to identify available network to attached communicating devices.

"The illustrative embodiment facilitates multiple network attached devices 10 being identified by the remote control device 4. After identification of the network attached device 110, the remote control device 4 dynamically learns the command codes of the identified network attached device through a sequence of protocol defined request and response messages. Once the remote control device 4 has received the codes for the network attached device 10, a user of the remote control device is able to select a device from among those devices that have been identified, and issue commands to that network attached device."

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pierre into Johnson to provide an efficient mechanism that provides broadcasting transmission of signal information from a server data processing system to a receiving data processing system whereas the server data processing system correctly identifies the device in a network and efficiently communicates with the receiving data processing system by pushing proactive delivery content that recognizes and identifies the requesting device.

As per claims 31, 41 and 50, Claims31, 41 and 50 are method claim of claim 11. Therefore claims 31, 41 and 50 are rejected under same scope as discussed in claim 11, supra.

As per claim 56, Johnson discloses the local realm is a wireless local area network (see column 6, line 55 – column 7, line 41, wireless device communicates through a wirelss connection with controller in a cellular network cluster).

b). Examiner take this opportunity to notify applicant that IDS submitted on August 12th, 2010 has been considered and entered.

/S. K. D./ Examiner, Art Unit 2451